REMARKS

Claims 1-16 have been examined and have been rejected on prior art grounds.

I. Formal Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing and returning the PTO SB/08 Form submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement of August 29, 2004, indicating that the documents cited therein have been considered. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for indicating acceptance of the drawings filed on March 29, 2004, and for acknowledging the foreign priority claim and receipt of the priority document.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Published Appln. 2001/0045966 to Inoue et al. ("Inoue")

Claims 1 and 10-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Inoue.

A. Claim 1

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Inoue. For example, the method of claim 1 employs an output processing module having multi-stage processing units with a preset processing sequence and activating at least a last-stage processing unit among the multi-stage processing units to set image data to output data and to implement output of an image. The multi-stage processing units include a color conversion processing unit and an XHTML analyzer processing unit. When the type of received data is a description file described in a predetermined markup language or a predetermined script language, the XHTML analyzer processing unit is assigned to process the received image data, and when the type of received

data is data in a CMY color system, the color conversion processing unit is assigned to process the received image data.

On the other hand, Inoue discloses a printer to be connected with a digital camera. This printer acquires an image as well as image additional information (including such as resolution information, color mode information, and flash on/off information, as indicated in Fig. 2) from a digital camera, selects printing control information based on the acquired image additional information, and executes the printing with the selected printing control information. However, Inoue fails to teach the claimed step of identifying the type of the received image data. Although, Figure 2 of Inoue teaches the transmission of image additional information from a digital camera to a printer, this information fails to include the type of the received image data. Further, Inoue fails to teach the claimed multi-stage processing units that set image data to output, where the multi-stage processing units are assigned to process received image data based on the type of image data received. Specifically, Inoue at least fails to teach assigning an XHTML analyzer when the type of received image data is a description file, and assigning a color conversion processing unit when the type of received image data is a data in a CMY color system. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Inoue for at least the foregoing reasons.

B. Claims 10-14

Since claims 10-14 are dependent upon claim 1, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

C. Claims 15-16

Since claim 15 contains features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim, Applicant submits that it is patentable for at least similar reasons. Since claim 16 is dependent upon claim 15, Applicant submits that it is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Inoue in view of U.S. Published Appln. 2002/0054344 to Tateyama ("Tateyama")

Claims 2-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Tateyama. Since claims 2 and 3 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicant submits that the rejection of such claims is now moot.

With regard to claims 4 and 5, Tateyama discloses a system in which a printer is connected with a digital camera and a set top box (STB) as a digital broadcast tuner. When direct printing an image, this system calculates the time required for each of the devices (such as a digital camera, a STB, and a printer) to execute an image process at respective steps of data conversion of an image. The system then performs the image process using a device that can perform the process in the shortest amount of time. Tateyama also mentions a data conversion process that converts JPEG data into RBG or CMYK image data.

However, Tateyama fails to teach at least the features of claim 1 described above. Specifically, Tateyama fails to teach assigning a processing of image data to, among multi-stage processing units capable of converting image data to output data, a specific-stage processing unit adequate for the type of the image data. Accordingly, since claims 4 and 5 are dependent upon

claim 1, and since Tateyama fails to cure the deficient teachings of Inoue with regard to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 5 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Inoue in view of U.S. Published Appln. 2002/0171857 to Hisatomi et al. ("Hisatomi")

Claims 6-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Hisatomi. Since claims 6-8 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicant submits that the rejection of such claims is now moot.

With regard to claim 9, Hisatomi merely discloses a printing system wherein a client apparatus processes document data in a first markup language format and a printing apparatus that that prints document data in a second markup language. *See* Hisatomi at paragraph [0016]. However, Hisatomi does not teach assigning a processing of image data to, among multi-stage processing units capable of converting image data to output data, a specific-stage processing unit adequate for the type of the image data. Accordingly, since claim 9 is dependent upon claim 1, and since Hisatomi fails to cure the deficient teachings of Inoue with regard to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 9 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency..

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kelly G. Hyndman 39,234/
Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 29, 2007